

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

EARNEST E. VAUGHN, SR.,)
also known as Earnest E. Vaughn,)
also known as Earnest Edward Vaughn, Sr.,)
also known as Earnest Edward Vaughn,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

Case No. 8:15-cv-01993-TLW

ABBEVILLE COUNTY; ABBEVILLE)
COUNTY SHERIFF; AGENT RYAN)
ABERNATHY, *in both capacities*; and)
BRANDON SCOTT, *in both capacities*,)

Defendants.)

ORDER

Plaintiff Earnest E. Vaughn, Sr., proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of his constitutional rights by Abbeville County, the Abbeville County Sheriff, a drug enforcement agent employed by the Abbeville County Sheriff's Department, and a South Carolina game warden. (Doc. #1). This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by United States Magistrate Judge Kevin McDonald, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court dismiss the case without prejudice and without service of process. (Doc. #21). Plaintiff's objections to the Report were due by July 10, 2015. Plaintiff failed to file objections, and this matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part,

the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report in accordance with this standard, and it concludes that the Magistrate Judge's legal and factual analyses are sufficient to warrant summary dismissal of this case. The Court again notes that Plaintiff has failed to file objections to the Report. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #21). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

July 21, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina